DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 272 UD 024 674

AUTHOR	Falk, Barbara
TITLE	Slogans, Policies and Practice in Multicultural Education in Australia. National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education. Discussion Paper No.2.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education, Woden (Australia).
PUB DATE	Mar 85
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Ethics; *Ethnic Groups; Foreign Countries; *Government School Relationship; Immigrants; Minority Groups; Multicultural Education; Political Issues; Politics
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia; Australians; Political Parties

ABSTRACT

This discussion paper traces the concepts and events which link slogans about multicultural education with policy statements of political parties and the implementing of these policies, through administrative agencies, to schools. The first section is a theoretical background and gives consideration to what an immigrant's political and moral rights are and should be. Section 2 gives some demographics about immigrant groups in Australia and a background on the country's political parties. Section 3 considers the implementation of government policies and how they filter down into the school system, the individual school, and finally the single classroom. Examples of policy statements are given with analyses of some of their possible interpretations and consequences. There are two appendices; one gives demographics of immigrants by state and the second offers some policy suggestions regarding further research and actions that should be taken to untangle political slogans from the useful actions of educators. (CG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265272

NACCME

National Advisory and Co-ordinating
Committee on Multicultural Education

SLOGANS, POLICIES AND PRACTICE IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA

DISCUSSION PAPER No. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Borthwick
NACCME, Australia

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 024674

SLOGANS, POLICIES AND PRACTICE IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA

Prepared by Barbara Falk, Research Associate, History Department, University of Melbourne, March, 1985 for the National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education

The National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education (NACCME) was established in 1984 to provide the Commonwealth Government with policy advice on multicultural education which refers broadly to educational policies and practices *in* and *for* a multicultural society. It endeavours to maintain a national perspective across the full educational spectrum by monitoring and co-ordinating development in multicultural education.

As one of its first tasks, NACCME has identified several areas of multicultural education, such as the educational needs of ethnic minorities and the rationale of multicultural education and intercultural understanding, as being in need of review and assessment. To this end, NACCME has commissioned scholars and educationalists with special expertise in each of these areas to examine critically relevant issues, to identify needs and, where possible, to propose strategies for future action.

An issue of special significance for national policy determination relates to the philosophy and rationale underlying the practice of multicultural education. In this context, NACCME is pleased to release Discussion Paper No. 2 entitled: *Slogans, Policies and Practice in Multicultural Education in Australia* by Dr Barbara Falk, Research Associate, History Department, University of Melbourne and formerly Director, Centre for the Study of Higher Education. This paper explores issues relating to the rationale for multicultural education and in particular, examines the gaps in the sequence from slogans to policies to practice in multicultural education in Australia.

It is hoped that, as a result of a considered and critical examination of the issues raised in this and other Discussion Papers, NACCME will be in a better position to formulate and recommend to Government relevant and desirable changes.

NACCME, therefore, invites public comment and reactions to Dr Falk's paper. To assist individuals who wish to comment, we have listed key questions and issues, as well as policy options, which we would like to be considered by respondents. The public will also be given an opportunity to comment more informally through a series of consultations NACCME hopes to conduct in the States/Territories.

All written comments should be forwarded to The Executive Officer, NACCME, PO Box 826, Woden, ACT, 2606.

NACCME hopes that with the release of this Discussion Paper it will, among other things, be able to act as a catalyst in developing an interest in multicultural education among educationists and the public at large.

Laksiri Jayasuriya
Chairperson
NACCME

Acknowledgements

The National Advisory and Co-ordinating Committee on Multicultural Education commissioned this work. I am indebted to Professor Laksiri Jayasuriya, Chairperson, for his understanding and stimulating co-operation.

My research assistant Margaret Arnot has made a major contribution to the paper. Her speedy, efficient work and acute comments were invaluable.

Mrs Ingrid Barker typed successive drafts with good humoured efficiency. The History Department of the University of Melbourne offered houseroom and facilities, and colleagues were patient and supportive.

The comments on 'rights' owe something to the criticism of an unpublished article by an anonymous referee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Section 1. Theoretical Background	4
Section 2. Demography and policies of major political parties	13
Section 3. Implementing policies—Systems, schools and classrooms	17
Notes to Section 1	27
Notes to Section 2	28
Notes to Section 3	29
Appendix 1: Demographic patterns	30
Appendix 2: A policy for NACCME as advisor and co-ordinator of research in multicultural education	36

INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with tracing the web of concepts and events which links slogans about multicultural education with policy statements of political parties and the implementing of these policies, through administrative agencies, to schools.

At each point of transmission from policy to practice, extraneous influences are brought to bear. Commonwealth policy on multicultural education may be modified by foreign policy. Budget considerations will be voiced by pressure groups with vested interests in other aspects of education or in competing areas of health and welfare. The implementing of policy begins in Federal and State Departments of Education. The Schools Commission, the Tertiary Education Commission and the Curriculum Development Centre play their parts as does the A.C.T. Schools Authority, and civil servants involved interpret according to their backgrounds and experience.

As you come closer to schools, where individual children acquire knowledge and skills, psychological theories of child development and current theories of learning become more important to decisions that are made. The education industry peddles products claimed to be aids to learning. Parent and community participation in schooling exercises influence in some States; federal and State policies on appointment and promotion of teachers, and union stances on these matters, affect what happens; population shift is an important factor in some areas—all of these influences play a part in what happens in schools. Ideas become real in action when a child learns and when any person in the process of education learns.

What then is the content of multicultural education that students, teachers, administrators and parents should imbibe? Is it the same in a one-teacher school in rural Victoria as in Fort Street High School in Sydney; in a technical school in inner-city Richmond, Melbourne; or in a primary school on the outskirts of Townsville?

The function and force of slogans and party political statements in shaping what is to be taught and what is to be learned is scrutinised in this paper. In order to give some semblance of realism to the discussion, Appendix 1 contains some important demographic facts about the Australian population, and a case study of the demography of metropolitan Melbourne which is to be read in conjunction with Sections 2 and 3. Appendix 2 addresses the function of NACCME in its advisory capacity and as co-ordinator of research in multicultural education.

Section 1.

Theoretical Background

It took an influential figure, A.J. Grassby, Minister for Immigration in the Labor Government, to bring the term multicultural into the public arena in Australia in 1973 through the publication *A Multicultural Society for the Future*.[1] It has, since then, been a key word in controversy about education in this country.

The word multicultural encapsulates a paradox; the unity of the nation-state is understood to be compounded of many cultures which remain distinct. There is to be 'equal access for all citizens to economic opportunity, well-being, the legal process and political power'.[2] There is also to be recognition of membership of a sub-national group, an *ethnic group*. Membership is based on nation-state of birth, but nation-states are created and dismembered while locality remains constant. For example, people who identify themselves as Latvians in Australia may have been born citizens of the U.S.S.R.

An ethnic group has been defined as 'a group of people who because of physical or cultural characteristics, receive unequal treatment and have a consciousness of kind and regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination'.[3] There are less restrictive definitions. For example, ethnic minority persons are 'members of Australian communities whose language and cultural background is not that of dominant Australian ethnic groups of English speaking origin'.[4]

In his introduction to Jean Martin's collected papers on ethnicity and pluralism Sol Encel says:

> we need to look at the theoretical implications of asserting that membership of an ethnic group is a valid concept which is not reducible to any other social category, and in particular that ethnic identification is not simply a form of 'false consciousness' in the Marxian sense.[5]

Ethnicity has, as yet, no formal definition in Australian law but one ethnic group in terms of both the above definitions is persons 'who are Aboriginal natives of Australia, Asia, Africa or the islands of the Pacific, or are persons of half blood'[6] as defined by the Electoral Act of Western Australia, 1907, Section 18.

Other arrivals in Australia have status as *immigrants* at first. Jean Martin defines immigrants as:

> residents who, by virtue of their not being Australian citizens by either birth or descent, belong to a category of person whom the State can control, direct or provide for (to their advantage or disadvantage) in some specific way.[7]

Two conflicting legal judgements have been made as to when an immigrant ceases to be an immigrant. Mr Justice Starke has ruled that an immigrant can at some time become a full member of the Australian community.[8] On the other hand, the High Court, as late as 1966, 'expressly asserted that possession of Australian citizenship did not prevent a person from being an immigrant and therefore liable to deportation'.[9]

When an immigrant ceases to be an immigrant does she/he then become an ethnic, and so no longer eligible for specific advantage or disadvantage? This is an important practical question. Consider, for example, the claim that a member of an ethnic group has a right to instruction in English, technical re-training

in the employer's time, or a right not to be deported if found guilty on a criminal charge. Once special benefits or freedom from special discrimination are linked to ethnicity and claimed as rights, some criteria of eligibility must be established. To legislate the degree of relationship by birth or descent which determines ethnic affiliation is to *ascribe* status to a person. Such ascription, as a prelude either to granting special privileges or to enforcing special restraints, is incompatible with the notion of distinct but equal citizens.

Under what circumstances and by what process can an individual be ascribed to an ethnic group in Australia? What right has an individual to choose his/her ethnic identity? Do children have this right?

Recent work on the concept of rights distinguishes legal and moral or human rights.[10] There are very interesting philosophical issues which cannot be explored in this paper. We must confine discussion to the force different concepts of rights have in deciding how an individual is identified as a member of an ethnic group.

The distinction between legal and human or moral rights is clearly displayed in the debate about abortion. The legal 'right to life' is prescribed by the laws relating to abortion, but the 'Right to Lifers' appeal is to a human or moral right, which, they assert, requires reform of the law. They hold that the right of the foetus is a right *sans phrase*—a right which is unqualified—that is, a right which always ought to be followed in cases to which it applies, rather than a *prima facie* right which is not absolute but is to be taken into account and given due weight against other *prima facie* rights with which it may conflict in this example, the right of a mother to continue her education, etc.

When the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, in *Review of Multicultural and Migrant Education 1980*, 3.4.12 states: 'The ethnic communities regard retention of their language as a right, and a necessity if their cultures are to be preserved and made available to the rest of society', they are appealing to a moral or human right. The rhetoric *appears* to appeal to a right *sans phrase*, a right which an individual member of an ethnic community has, which functions as trumps over the collective goals of the nation-state. (The defence of this position is heavily dependent on a non-utilitarian theory of justification).

The problem with human rights is the identification of the addressees, those people who have a corresponding duty to see that the rights are maintained. Because all people are the addressees of human rights, these rights are sometimes called *manifesto rights*; they hoist a moral standard but have no mode of enforcement. They are nonetheless of great importance. They are the ultimate criteria by which we, as individuals, determine our moral duty to obey or change the law of the land.[11] The classic example is the case of the conscientious objector who, when conscripted, states that he has a moral or religious duty to refuse to fight.

We are now in a position to ask: is there a right to determine one's own ethnic affiliation, and to demand special treatment on grounds of that ethnicity? If so, is it a right *sans phrase* or a *prima facie* right to be weighed against other considerations?

The determination of the nature of this right becomes important only if its exercise is called into question. A *de facto* right to define one's own ethnicity or religion is not called into question unless claims for a benefit or relief from a detriment on grounds of ethnicity are denied by the addressee of the claimed rights.

The right to maintain one's own language is a *de facto* right; it is called into question only if special financial provision for learning the language is requested as a right, or provision of multicultural library services etc. If this is a *prima facie* right then the claims of special provision for Catholic schools, for example, would have to be balanced against it. The case would be different if it were adjudged a right *sans phrase*. In either case the addressees are the people of Australia who, under a democratic constitution, give their verdict through the ballot box.

Australia is polyethnic, i.e. inhabited by people born in many nation-states, therefore Australia *should* be multicultural. As a means to that end Australia *should* have multicultural education. These statements follow from a claim that the right to maintain one's culture and language is a right *sans phrase*.

Australia should have multicultural education is a slogan.

> Slogans provide rallying symbols for the key ideas and attitudes of educational movements. They both express and foster community of spirit, attracting new adherents and providing reassurance to veterans. No one defends his favourite slogan as a helpful stipulation or as an accurate reflection of the meanings of its constituent terms. It is thus idle to criticise a slogan for formal inadequacy or for inaccuracy in the transcription of usage.[12]

Slogans are not axioms from which practical conclusions can be derived. But slogans are sometimes understood as literal doctrines or arguments rather than merely as rallying symbols. It is then necessary to ask not what is the *real* meaning of the slogan, but what are the doctrines which are implied and what are the arguments by which they are defended; what policies are put forward and what practices are followed in the name of the slogan? By what criteria are these to be assessed?

The slogan we are considering then appeals to a moral right, a right *sans phrase*, and the addressees are all citizens of the Australian Commonwealth. No policy or program can be derived from this slogan—it states an ideal. Can this ideal be realised? If so, how, and by what arguments can the means adopted be validated? Jean Martin argued that 'structural pluralism'[13] was a necessary step towards the realisation of the multicultural ideal. The structures were to be organisations *within* ethnic groups which would enable them to exercise political muscle, as do trade unions, professional associations and religious denominations. I cannot find, in her writing, a statement that ethnic groups should seek to become separate political constituencies. Since constituencies in all Australian states are determined by geographical location, to have suggested this would have required revision of this principle. She wrote:

> this robust tradition of pluralism recognises ethnic structures forming one sub-system of roles and relations, among many others, through which individuals in our kind of society try to secure the matching of their inner selves, their identity, with life style and behaviour.[14]

'Our kind of society' is a democracy and the argument is that structural and cultural pluralism *to a moderate degree* is not incompatible with democratic ideals and practice.[15]

Democratic ideals require that an individual be free to move out of an ascribed status. Any form of structural pluralism which inhibited this freedom would be a caste system incompatible with democracy.

If, as Jean Martin suggests, 'ethnic group' is a new social form—an interest group as well as a community of family and social ties that is more than a

transitional stage in the absorption of minority groups into a larger population—some demarcation of boundaries of such groups will become necessary.

The criteria for membership may not be enforceable by law, but physical or linguistic signs may be interpreted by the population at large as proof of ethnic identification. Negative discrimination of individuals so identified may result.

Thus in Jean Martin's writings ethnic groups are interest groups among the various interest groups in the Australian polity. Conflict of interests between groups would be solved within the constitutional framework of the Commonwealth of Australia. This is 'consensus bounded conflict'. The conflict is limited by consensus that the nation-state, with its existing social and economic and political structure, is to be maintained.

Members of a group adhering to customs and behaviours differing from the majority norms would use 'clout' to gain support for legitimising aspects of their preferred *life style*. Members of such a group would seek to improve *life chances* either directly or through organisations open to all Australian citizens and by mobilising their groups' support for those which promoted their interests. The State, as conciliator, would mediate, and more equitable distribution of commodities and equality of access to power would be brought about. Self-defined ethnic groups would pursue their interests by having handicaps they attributed to ethnicity removed.

But do all Anglo-Australians have equal life chances? Are we saying only that the disadvantage of ethnic groups should not be proportionately greater than the Anglo-Australians as a group, taking into account the class and gender structure of each group?[16]

If Jean Martin's position is adopted, then what should follow is an assessment of the degree to which inadequate command of English with lack of skills appropriate in Australia for achieving economic and political power are a partial explanation of the larger proportion of 'ethnics' in the lowest socio-economic stratum of the population. Another factor to be taken into account is the degree to which the socio-economic status and cultural origins of immigrants, selected by successive governments, have restricted their opportunities to find work—and the other side of the coin—how far the distrust of strangers who are perceived as threats to jobs and Australian life styles has constrained 'life chances' for 'ethnics'.

These are empirical questions and most of the writing on multiculturalism is concerned with them. Some clarification of the political theory underpinning Martin's position is required.

> Classical demographic theory conceives the public interest in terms of both results and process... Public interest is measured by the soundness of the decisions reached in the light of the needs of the community and by the scope of public participation in reaching them.[17]

Participation is evidence of equality of power and recognition of human dignity. Mass democracy has, because of the size of the national units, thrown up specialised groups of leaders, in political parties, trade unions, co-operatives, corporations, associations of employers and organised professions. The concept of a *political elite* can be interpreted widely to include those leaders who speak for their group, or it can be restricted to the Cabinet or Caucus of the formal political parties.

Political life can be said to concern all those varieties of activity that influence significantly the authoritative policy adopted for society and the way it is put into practice. If this broad definition is used then participation in political decision-making can be at many different levels. It is the nature of the decision reached that makes a decision *political* in the broad sense; in the sense of power relations. In the narrower sense *political* refers to decisions relating to the control of political parties and governmental decisions which have a direct and significant influence on the public.

The basic democratic concept of the accountability of decision-makers to their constituents means that within a democratic constitution only the parliament is accountable to the whole population. The sectional interests of a trade union or a religious denomination or corporation are represented by leaders who are accountable to a narrower constituency. Their access to such power as they have, and the exercise of that power, is possible within the democratic political (in the broad sense) sub-system.

Can democracy diffuse political power sufficiently throughout society to inculcate people of all walks of life with a justifiable feeling that they have the power to participate in decisions that affect themselves and the common life of the community, especially the immediate community in which they work and spend most of their waking hours and energy?

It can be argued that this can be achieved if the scope of political activity is seen to include the larger private institutions. Democratic control of companies, churches and local government would give more people access to decision-making. Equality of opportunity to obtain a position of political power (in the narrow sense of political) will leave exercise of power in the hands of few in contemporary mass societies. Party machines leave voters feeling powerless. Constitutional political power is in the hands of the few party leaders. Informal power is in the hands of heads of corporations and companies, trade union leaders, professional associations and organised religious groups, and the media.

Are organisations of persons characterised by ethnic origin, i.e. birthplace, language and cultural baggage, sufficiently similar to these interest groups to be treated as additional units in an already pluralist Australia?

Jean Martin seems to suggest they are. Smolicz puts forward a view that his 'balanced biculturals' will pursue their public interest in equal access to economic opportunity, well-being, the legal process and political power as a normal interest group while pursuing their private interest in maintenance of language and cultural difference.[18] Bullivant sees that 'cultural dissonance', i.e. conflict of ethical values and the customs in which they are enshrined, makes this an impossible solution.[19] He finds the separation of public and private interest untenable because a minority group does not have the power in the public sphere to protect a life style unacceptable to the hegemonic majority. If the alien custom breaks the law, then power to introduce new legislation is the avenue open within the concept of consensus bounded conflict. Representation of ethnic interests in the State and Federal Parliaments and testing the interpretation of the Common Law in the courts are the legitimate sources of protection.

The apparatus of the State as the conciliator of interest groups will ensure that justice is done when interests conflict. Patriotic sentiments and shared beliefs on which consensus depends will ensure that the conciliator's decision is accepted. The public interest in democratic process will be met by participation in the political activities of interest groups and other sub-national organisations.

The role of the State as the conciliator between conflicting interest groups is challenged by Marxist theory.

The basic idea of the historical role and meaning of the State in Marxist theory presents the State as the product and manifestation of the *irreconcilability* of class antagonisms. The State maintains order as an instrument for oppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie. The parliament, the courts, the army and the police do not maintain an equitable balance between conflicting interests; they enforce the inequities of the capitalist economy.[20]

From this standpoint, people of minority ethnic origin are misled if they have a false consciousness of themselves as ethnic rather than as either poor working class or bourgeois. Since each ethnic grouping may include all socio-economic classes to consider one's ethnic community as the primary source of succour is to mistake the allies with whom one must combine to achieve a more equal distribution of the world's goods.

To say this is not to affirm that ethnic origin plays *no part* in determining the place a family or individual may have in the socio-economic structure of Australia. The invention of the term "eth-class" is an attempt to merge the apparent dichotomy.[21] It does not clarify 'the *relative contributions* of cultural and structural factors in ethnic relations'. To do this requires considering the interactive role of ideas (cultural factors) and the economic and material conditions of actors (structural factors).[22] Both Marx and Weber regarded the material realm as *causally prior*. Both would state that the idea of ethnicity, like religious ideas, can be influential over time in a form different from that involved in its origins.[23] The material conditions which generated negative identification of individuals and groups as ethnics may change over time, leaving a residue of ideas (negative feelings expressed in words and caricature) which may be revived in a new guise under different conditions.

For example, anti-Chinese feeling generated by frenetic competition on the goldfields may lie dormant until attention is focussed on the urban Chinese during a depression. The reasons given for antagonism (work too hard, do not mind sub-standard conditions) may differ from those publicised in the past (dirty, lascivious, etc.). The aspects of identifiable difference that become targets vary as the stereotype of a particular group is seen in the perspective of new material conditions. In the interval, difference has continued to be noted, but with muted animosity. 'Ideas have like switchmen determined the tracks along which action has been pushed by the dynamic of interest.'[24]

Technological developments have so greatly increased the range and scope of ideas and images that can be communicated that the function of the 'switchmen' can be readily observed.

To dismiss ethnicity as false consciousness is to emphasise the structural problems of a capitalist economy. The acceptance of this analysis would inhibit ethnic groups and their sympathisers from seeking palliatives on the grounds of their ethnicity. Whether immediate amelioration should be sought is from a classical Marxist position a question of tactics.

One does not have to be a Marxist to observe that if a higher proportion of members of all ethnic groups combined are poorer than the average of members of the majority group, then before poverty can be attributed solely to ethnic status in the country of settlement the class structure of immigrants on arrival must be taken into account.

Even if it is allowed that a classical Marxist analysis presents an acceptable explanation of the comparative poverty of the working class—including immigrant and ethnic groups—these groups may be seen to suffer from additional specific handicaps.

If a higher proportion of members of a specific ethnic group are poorer than the average of members of other ethnic communities, then factors other than ethnicity in general must be sought in explanation. This group may have a higher proportion of illiterate, unskilled workers; there may be a larger cultural distance between the culture of the incoming group and that of the receiving country; the structure, calligraphy and pronunciation of the immigrants' native tongue may render the learning of English more difficult. Some concomitants of ethnicity, language and culture have to be taken into account in the analysis.

The claim that government owes financial assistance for the maintenance of mother tongue (interpreted as either local dialect or high culture language) as a moral duty has been discussed above. It could be claimed on the same grounds that the teaching of ESL and translation and interpreter services should be supported. The Commonwealth Department of Education publication *Towards a National Language Policy* describes the situation concisely.[25] In particular it draws attention to Anglo-Australian speakers of non-standard English, who together with non-native speakers require access to standard Australian English for 'equality of opportunity'. The document advances the argument that principles of multiculturalism require that standard English be learned by Anglo-Australians as an addition to and not in substitution for the socially cohesive non-standard English.

The teaching of languages will be discussed in the section on administration, schools and classrooms. Language is mentioned here in the context of considering 'ethnicity' as a non-reducible term in political and social discourse. This paper cannot be expanded to develop the appropriate argument about community or foreign languages and non-standard English as the native tongue of groups. If by non-standard Australian English we mean working class language, then 'restricted and elaborated codes' and 'mass culture' and 'bourgeois culture' would have to be analysed and the class element in disadvantage accruing from language would have to be evaluated.

Language and culture are usually bracketed as the 'baggage' that immigrants carry with them into their new land. In a sense it is a mistaken metaphor, for language and culture are what the immigrant *is*, not external luggage to be opened and sanitised by customs officers.

Much has been written about culture. As with language, it has been claimed that immigrants have a right to maintenance and development of their own culture. Does this mean the high culture or the working class culture of the nation-state of origin at the time the emigrant left, or the culture as it has developed over the time the immigrant has dwelt in Australia or the imported culture as it has formed in Australia?

It is in discussing the moral right of a group to maintenance of its own culture, and the reciprocal duty of the host society, that the question of 'cultural dissonance' and the limits of tolerance become crucial issues. It is not sufficient to say, 'this code of conduct is believed to be right in this culture—that code of conduct is believed to be right in the other culture—understand the circumstances in which both codes developed'.

When confronted by unacceptable conduct in classroom or playground, a teacher will probably try to reason with the offenders, and failing this appeal, will resort to enforcing a prohibition. It is obvious that there are limits to tolerance at this level. What is usually not made explicit is the frame of reference, the moral code on which the teacher is relying. How in practice can understanding the social origins of different codes help teachers cope with an instance of *fundamental* cultural dissonance?[26]

A citizen has a de facto right to perform any act which does not contravene a law or a regulation enforceable in the courts. If an act acceptable in a minority culture is illegal in Australia, it can be argued that the law of the host country must prevail. The counter claim that laws must be altered to accommodate changes in the cultural composition of Australian society can be asserted to be a consequence of a policy of integration, and could only take effect through appropriate Acts of the Parliament.

One must turn to demography and party political policies to test which of these opposing positions will prevail in the near future.

In concluding this section we return to Sol Encel's question: 'Is membership of an ethnic group a valid concept which is not reducible to any other category?'[27]

The word "ethnicity" has no precise, consistent connotation as used in the contexts of social science and education in Australia; it is sometimes broad enough to include all citizens of Australia. To use the word in the sentence 'All Australians are ethnics', is to assert that membership of a minority group does not entail inferiority. It would not be necessary to make this assertion unless the word *ethnic* was, in common usage, a derogatory term. The South Australian Multicultural Education Co-ordinating Committee adopts a definition which states 'Ethnic groups should not be confused with racial groups. It is possible for an ethnic group to be a racial group as well but often this is not the case.'[28] Is it necessary to clarify this because people can make the slide from the prejudice and stereotyping which characterise a racist position to the application of the term *ethnic* to an individual or a group?

In the previous discussion we mentioned the difficulty of defining the boundaries of an ethnic group and the consequential problems of establishing criteria for membership by Regulation or Common Law. We pointed out that ascription would contravene democratic theory and convention. For what purpose, then, is it necessary to signify persons whose stay in a country in which they were not born exceeds that of a guest worker, or the period prescribed for application for naturalisation? Identification would be required either to confer a benefit or impose a restriction.

The reasons for conferring benefit and imposing restrictions on ethnic schools are quite specific. Children, it is claimed, have a *right* 'to have their cultural and lingual heritages respected and sustained in the curricula of schools'.[29] If ethnic schools are to be recognised as supplementary to provision in systemic schools then financial provision and supervision of conditions of teaching and learning must follow. The term 'ethnic' should be legally defined, unless, as suggested by Marlene Norst, the term *Community Language School* is substituted as the name for *Ethnic or Saturday School*.[30] Her reason for suggesting the change is that the name *ethnic school* (incidentally not used by the supporting communities) has 'pejorative connotations which would militate against acceptance of these schools as Australian schools for Australian children'.[31] Her view is consistent with the emphases of the multicultural co-ordinating committees

that community languages should be learned by *all* Australian children. The use of the word 'ethnic' in this context may be counter-productive. If *community language schools* were to replace ethnic schools, then the language component of the curriculum would have to be separated from any teaching designed to promote minority group solidarity. Learning about another culture in order to understand it is different from imbibing a culture in order to grow up a member of the group.

If the component 'disadvantage' is included in the concept of ethnicity as in one of our original definitions, i.e. 'a group of people who because of physical or cultural characteristics *receive unequal treatment* and have a consciousness of kind and *regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination* an argument can be advanced for special benefits, positive discrimination,[32] on the grounds that certain aspects of their ethnicity created disadvantage in both an economic and social sense. The confinement to a low social stratum is partly accounted for by referring to the lack of the national language, and the difference from, or ignorance of, the assumed Australian national culture.

On this argument *working class* cannot be substituted for *ethnic* without residue as a ground of disadvantage; ethclass is the explanation. But would it not be possible to argue that the concept of ethnicity could be avoided by specifying the components of ethnicity which contribute to illiteracy and/or lack of skills? A deaf and dumb Australian-born working class child lacks the national language and has limited knowledge of the national culture, is deficient in skills and may regard himself/herself as an object of collective discrimination and have a 'consciousness of kind'.

Because the word has a cluster of meanings, precise thinking will be assisted by considering which aspect of the concept is being referred to in discussion.

Section 2.

Demographic and Party Political Background

It was pointed out in the introduction that many events and ideas influence the translation of slogans about multicultural education into the curricula and the conduct of schools. Settlement patterns of immigrant groups must be considered as one influence on the policies and practice of multicultural education. The most recent statistics available (from the 1981 Census) are summarised and assessed in Appendix 1. In addition, a case study of metropolitan Melbourne is presented as background for analyses of the administration and practice of schooling in Victoria.

While it can be observed that there has been a general trend for ethnic minorities to become more geographically integrated with the whole population as they have become familiar with Australia, economic, social and cultural elements affect patterns of segregation and integration, making the situation far more complex. Some groups live in a more segregated fashion than others when they first arrive. Some well-established groups remain segregated even while making a marked impact on the economic and cultural life of a city. Competence in English, and level of education and cultural distance from the Anglo-Australian majority affect the rate and extent of integration.

In discussing definitions of ethnicity in Section 1, the plausibility of the argument that a statistical analysis of the ethnic composition of the Australian population based on birthplace ascribes ethnic identity to large numbers of persons was given weight. It is also clear that statistics relating to birthplace do not identify second and third generations who may have chosen to group themselves by an ancestor's place of birth. In this paper the statistics refer only to an individual's place of birth.

Statistics relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders have also been included, but to have discussed those relating to nationality and parentage was beyond the scope of this paper.

Of the total Australian population of 14,576,330 in 1981, 21.8 per cent were born overseas.[1] The settlement patterns of immigrant Australians vary greatly throughout Australia as a whole. The most striking feature of the Census statistics was the great diversity in the Australian population; the tables detailing birthplace have coded 101 responses.

Those born in England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, if taken together, were by far the most significant immigrant group in all States and Territories, accounting for over one-third of the immigrants living in Australia in 1981. Many New Zealanders also chose to settle in Australia; in 1981, they constituted significant numbers in each State, and in total comprised 1.2 per cent of the Australian population.

Australia's largest immigrant group from a non-English speaking country was the Italian-born, yet of the five most significant groups—Italian, Yugoslavian, Greek, German and Dutch-born—the Italian-born were the most erratically distributed around Australia, with communities ranging in size from the huge group in Victoria to the relatively insignificant group in Tasmania. Communities

of Yugoslav and Greek-born also varied markedly in significance from State to State. It was only the German-born and Dutch-born who were relatively evenly spread throughout Australia, comprising at least 0.5 per cent of the total population of each State and Territory.

The newest immigrant group which has had a marked demographic and social impact on Australia is the Vietnamese-born. In 1981 there were seventeen times as many of Vietnamese in Australia as there were in 1976. This rate of increase varied enormously across Australia, from a four-fold increase in Tasmania to a thirty-four-fold increase in Victoria over 1976 and a thirty-six-fold increase in Western Australia. Despite these dramatic figures, the actual numbers of Vietnamese migrants are still minute compared with the large numbers of people in the migrant groups from Britain, New Zealand, northern and southern Europe.

Appendix 1 documents the demographic diversity of the States.

The complicated settlement patterns of immigrant Australians become even more intriguing if the large urban areas where most immigrants live are analysed in detail. Aspects of the ethnic population in Melbourne have been examined, using the publication[9] *Melbourne... social atlas*, compiled from the 1981 Census data. Different patterns of segregation and integration emerge from an analysis of different overseas-born populations including those born in non-English speaking countries, and recent arrivals who do not speak English well.

What is the impact of residential segregation and of differing patterns of rural and urban settlement on the administration and conduct of education in the various States? To what extent do the policies of political parties take the complexities of the demographic picture into account? The demographic differences between the States have been shown to be considerable—are these differences reflected in the plans of State departments of education? What problems and possibilities do patterns of settlement pose for creating equality of access to education?

These are hard questions to answer; the task of elucidating the play of power in decision-making about multicultural education is beyond the scope of this paper.

We have already noted the senses in which political action may occur in formal and informal ways. A number of agencies have been quoted as exemplars of the influence of State instrumentalities and organised special interest groups. To them can be added, among the others, the Catholic Office of Education, the Headmasters Conference, the Defence of Government Schools, the Ethnic Communities Council and COASIT.

Achieving a compromise between conflicting interests presents a challenge to political policy-makers:

> Policies must contain more than mere generalised platitudes—and they must avoid unnecessarily detailed legislative prescriptions vulnerable to political dissection during election campaigns and to insurmountable problems in implementation.[10]

There is a dynamic relationship between the population and policies, and changes in popular mood have to be taken into account when policies are reformulated.

Assuming these observations to be correct, what, if any, are the stated differences between the policies of the major Australian parties? These policies must be considered in relation to the theoretical analysis in Section 1 and to patterns of settlement. In the final section the effect of any differences on systems of education and on schools will be noted.

The balance between the ambit of Federal and State control of education shifts from time to time. There are also differences in emphasis on some points between a Federal party and one or more of the State or local branches, though their broad general statements reflect a core of agreement. This is true of both major political parties.

The national ALP policy has as a central objective equality of *educational opportunity* and *more equal educational outcomes*. The States differ as to whether these objectives will be achieved through redressing practical disadvantages of Australian children of recent migrant background or through multicultural education for all Australian children. The shift from redress of disadvantage to benefit of diversity of cultures is general in Labor party platforms. The 1984 National Conference, however, stated:

> 10(b) A Federal Labor Government will accept the responsibility to ensure...that the structures and practices of common national interest uphold universal human values

and

> 32(a) A Labor Government will recognise the value of ethnic diversity within the framework of democratic values and of sexual and racial equality.[11]

The pendulum swings from emphasis on the value of diversity to the need for national unity in what must be a continuing effort to find a balance when there is cultural dissonance. Western Australian policy avoids this problem altogether. Since Western Australia had the highest proportion of persons born in English speaking countries and low ethnic diversity in 1981, the problems of cultural dissonance would appear less pressing. In that State the cultural distance between the Aboriginal people and the Torres Strait Islanders from the majority group makes a policy of reconciliation of diversity more difficult.In Victoria, the general policy of devolution of responsibility to local education districts and school councils sites many problems in schools. N.S.W. policy places slightly more emphasis on control through a Curriculum Development and Assessment Authority. These relatively slight differences are unimportant at the policy level because the generality of the statements allows for a range of practices in their name.

The essential difference between the Labor Party platform and that of the Liberal/ National Party coalition is stated by the Federal Liberal Party thus:

> The goal of the Coalition parties is the achievement of equality of educational opportunity not Labor's goal of equality of educational outcomes.[12]

Conservative parties recognise the importance of an education system which preserves the status quo. The importance of educating for shared values is expressed with subtlety, and problems of multiculturalism are down-played. There are no policies which specify provisions for immigrant children—their requirements are to be met by the proposed Basic Competencies Program:

> Through the Basic Competencies Program we aim to ensure that no young Australian will leave school without mastering basic literacy and numeracy skills.[13] (pp. 6-7)
>
> The development of personal independence and capability requires the ability to reason and communicate clearly. Social, cultural, educational and economic opportunity is out of reach for those who cannot read, write, express themselves and calculate adequately...

Children who have special linguistic or cultural 'needs' will be provided for through Commonwealth Schools Commission programs along with those

disadvantaged for other reasons. The objective is that education for all should reach 'an *acceptable standard*' through 'positive discrimination towards' *needy schools*.

As with the Labor parties, there are discernible differences between States, ranging from the Western Australian goal of 'integration of migrants into the wider community as quickly as possible... although ethnic groups may retain their own traditions and culture if they wish'[14]—to the Victorian policy which contains a brief section on provisions for immigrant children:

> The number of ESL teachers will be increased in schools on a needs basis, administrative and curriculum support will be provided for teachers, and consultative mechanisms with ethnic communities established. The development of Community Language Programs is seen as being provided 'where such a need has been demonstrated, with extension based upon research': that is, these language programs are primarily to cater for the special needs of immigrants rather than providing 'community languages for all Victorians'. Ethnic schools and their teaching staff will be registered.
>
> Curricula should develop the skills necessary to enable the individual to integrate effectively into the community, and to establish sound, tolerant relationships with people of diverse attitudes, cultures, philosophies and socio-economic groups.

A committee entrusted with the formulation of a code of ethics for teachers recommended:

> ...ensuring that all matters of controversy or personal belief are treated with impartiality; ensuring that the education system is not used as a vehicle for indoctrination of children to a particular point of view.[15] (p.18)

The other major party, the Democrats, takes a traditional small 'l' liberal view. In a very general way education is to remedy disadvantage, including the disadvantage of being a migrant, and also to reflect the demographic reality of Australian society. English speaking children are to have an opportunity to learn a second language and to study the contribution of other cultures to Australia and the world; text books should be free from bias; early schooling should be in the home language whenever possible.

The differences in the policies of the same political party in different States show the dynamic relationship between demographic patterns of settlement and party political statements. The process of converting slogans about multicultural education into actions is responsive to the mix of persons in the electorate as well as the need to conform to the overall policy of the party.

Section 3.

Implementing policies—systems, schools and classrooms

When the generalities expressed in slogans and policies have to be implemented in administrative decisions, in curricula for schools and in lessons in classrooms, the intricate web of sentiments and theories, financial, political and social constraints is revealed.

It is important to consider issues in multicultural education as complications in systems of education which are in disarray for other and deep-seated reasons. When David Bennet wrote in 1979, 'a good school system would be one in which all students become socio-economic successes and that is why there are no good school systems', he had in mind the difficulties inherent in a meritocratic society for policies directed towards 'equality of opportunity' and 'equality of outcomes'.

Within a framework which sets both these goals, the problems of multicultural education become those of identifying specific disadvantages attaching to children born into a non-Australian culture and/or with a native language other than Australian English. Each child should be matched to an Anglo-Australian child of similar socio-economic status and provision made to equal her/his opportunities to the others so that equality of outcome—that is, socio-economic success—would be equivalent.

To point this out is to disparage neither the proper humane considerations nor the political expediency which invigorates efforts to mitigate disadvantage, nor to argue that such measures are unnecessary. It is, however, to suggest that realistic appraisal of what can be achieved within the total situation must continue.

It is not feasible to include an analysis of the assumed monoculture of the Anglo-Celtic majority group in this paper. Readers will be familiar with the many books and papers discussing 'class' in Australia, bourgeois and working class cultures, the various analyses of 'knowledge' and of the 'alienation' of working class school children from their teachers and from the academic curriculum of comprehensive high schools. They will be aware of the arguments on both sides of the bitter debate about funding of non-government schools and of the 'sorting' function of schools through the medium of competition, and they are aware of the suggested panaceas. It is in this context that discussion of multicultural education must proceed.

We begin by asking how the goals of 'equality of opportunity' and 'equality of outcomes' affect plans for multicultural education and what goes on in classrooms.

The principle of *equality* in education can be, and is, translated into systems of education that appear to be remarkable for their differences rather than their similarities. Consider the arguments by which the Victorian Education Department has justified its differing practices over the years.

A centralised bureaucratic structure was once considered necessary to ensure that the same content of education at primary level was available to each child in the rural school of a country town as to each child in a Melbourne middle class suburb or an inner city working class area. Spring, despite the fluctuations in climate, was taught on the same day. The school paper brought poems and improving literature equally for all children to read. If a pupil changed schools

his/her program could continue without a break. Equality meant the same lessons taught by teachers who had all learned the *best* way to present the material (at one time in the Herbartian steps). Equality required that a child was in a class with coevals and was promoted according to age.

What could be more unequal says today's expert—equal means to each according to needs.[1] 'Funds are allocated to schools on *needs* basis.' This interpretation of equality requires consideration of each child in his/her social group. To receive equal benefit, unequal treatment is necessary. 'Schools must meet the needs of their students'.[2] This is another slogan. Students do not have entities, needs. Students need, that is, *should* have, or have a right to, specific knowledge or skills or modes of learning. If some experience hurdles in acquiring the same goals as the others, they are *disadvantaged*. They are denied equal life chances, 'weapons' for gaining access to property, prestige and power. They have an inferred right to extra facilities.

Criteria upon which to estimate disadvantage are produced by many authorities. The Victorian Education Department provides for 'the special needs of any group of persons who may be disadvantaged in relation to education by reason of social background, culture, sex, disability or otherwise.' 'A school is declared disadvantaged on the basis of the social and financial community from which it draws its students, not in terms of standards of facilities and resources provided by the school.'[3]

These guidelines include immigrant children identified by their country of birth or that of their parents. Ethnic children are among the disadvantaged, and are therefore entitled, on the ground of ethnicity, to finance for ESL, bilingual education teaching aides, withdrawal classes, etc. But the rhetoric of multiculturalism states that foreign origin is not a disadvantage, that the bearer of a different culture is a benefactor to Australia, so that curricula must be changed on grounds of equity and because inclusion of ethnic cultural components will benefit Anglo-Australians. ESL and Languages Other Than English are justifiable as a means to utilitarian ends (so called 'service multilingualism') as well as a necessary part of the revised humanities and social studies which are to be the basis of a new consensus in Australia.

The New South Wales Education Department defines multicultural education as:

> a combination of policies, programs and practices directed at ensuring that all schools recognise and accept the multicultural nature of Australian society and take positive steps to provide educational opportunities which will promote national unity through a deeper understanding of the cultural pluralism of our people.[4]

At the administrative level the problems of maintaining a balance between central control and local decision are crucial. Administrators working on a consensus model of society rely on a groundswell of changing attitudes in the people to carry to fruition a policy involving change. The decision to direct the rate and direction of change requires firm central control. It is possible to see both these modes in the education departments of the States. The effectiveness of working in one or other way will in part depend on the demographic realities to which attention has already been drawn. In part, the political interests of the reigning party will be significant, though the political complexion of the minority groups is not negligible.

Victoria and Queensland provide examples in which this issue can be considered. The educational issues of fostering the study of community languages in primary and secondary schools and in teaching ESL differ from those raised by introducing multiculturalism into the total curriculum, and they will be explored separately.

Queensland has, at the time of writing, a National Party in government; Victoria is governed by the Labor Party. Appendix 1 will show how different is the demographic mix in each State (e.g. there are relatively low immigrant densities in Queensland).

The document which remains central to Queensland policy is *Education for a Multicultural Society*, a discussion paper based on a report to the Council of Directors of the Queensland Department of Education, prepared by the Working Party on Multicultural Education, first printed in June 1979 and now in its third printing.[5] It states that:

> programs and provisions in all Queensland State schools should emphasise the intrinsic worth of all peoples and the positive contributions that differences among groups and individuals make to the whole society.
>
> The curriculum (the total learning experience provided through the school) should be multicultural in choice of content and global in perspective. The variety of social and ethnic groups in Australian society should be made evident in the illustrations, stories, and information offered to children. All pupils should have access to accurate information about cultural similarities and differences. All people should be presented as individuals, preferably being allowed to speak for themselves, and not being judged exclusively against the norms of others.

Within such a framework, the department visualises:

> the total curriculum permeated by multicultural objectives in which are embedded specific studies for and about different cultural groups including those studies which have as a specific focus the language and language needs of members of different groups.

The Queensland Education Department recognises the need to involve the local community in both *consultant* and *resource* roles and points to the primary need to change people's attitudes:

> sensitivity is needed in dealing with bias and prejudice as these occur in interactions, in subject matter, in books and other teaching materials, and in methods of presentation.

The demands of multicultural education will only be met when *all* schools formulate plans of action appropriate to the specific needs of their students, drawing on the support and resources of their local communities, education departments and other agencies.

The report demonstrates awareness that there are cultural variations *within* any given community: 'social, familial, linguisitic, socio-economic and personal factors shape unique patterns for individual development'.

It goes on to stress that balance between the desire of cultural minorities to maintain their own cultures and their need to operate within the mainstream culture is not easily resolved. Congruence between the values, beliefs and goals of parents from a minority culture and those of the school is desirable, but not always possible. Even when the school does attempt to provide cultural maintenance opportunities, its program must be flexible enough to allow minority groups to opt for preparation for life in the mainstream society instead of maintaining their own culture if this is their wish. Alternatively, the school needs

to be capable of developing the capacities of *all* (ethnic and mainstream groups—parents, students *and* teachers) for life in a multicultural society.

It is interesting to note that the language of justification in the Queensland report is couched in terms of 'cultural identity', 'self-esteem' and 'authenticity', rather than in terms of 'equity', 'elimination of disadvantage' and 'life chances'.

Although the importance of community participation in both a consultative and resource role is recognised, the Queensland policy stresses the value of centralised initiatives:

> Little widespread change is likely to occur unless policy statements are made at the central level and are supported at all other levels within the education system. Although such statements do not necessarily bring about change, they do provide security and boost confidence for those involved at the school level where the real change must occur. (p.11)
>
> ...to achieve the goal of unity with diversity, differential school programs should flow from centrally developed curricular guidelines. (p.13)

Consequently, a great deal of the funding for multicultural education in Queensland has been channelled into centralised primary and secondary curriculum projects rather than into community initiatives.

In Victoria the Director General of Education issued a paper in 1979 which can serve as a basis for comparison between the two States at that time. The Victorian statement is less detailed and does not raise the possibility of conflict of values, but subsequent Ministerial Paper No. 6, 1984 does recognise the problem. This states that 'schools should...find ways' of reconciling differences where values conflict and expresses confidence that 'consensus about curriculum policy will be possible through ongoing discussion and negotiation'.[6]

The general policy statements in 1979 were similar to those in the Queensland document. There is a common concern with life style rather than life chances:

> 'All our citizens should become proficient in the use of English' because it is the predominant language in Australia, therefore, effective English is necessary to 'live here effectively'.
> Migrants and their children should have the opportunity to learn and study the language, customs and history of their forebears.'

The basis of this principle is less explicit. It includes several prescriptive generalisations not linked together as causally related:

(i) 'Australia is a multicultural society.'

(ii) 'Australia...benefits from the rich heritage of cultures and languages of its many ethnic communities.'

(iii) 'schools and administrators need to develop programs that will reinforce the contribution made to Australian society by the migrants who have come to settle here.'

(iv) A quotation from the Galbally Report 1978, which stresses that 'ethnic identity' must be 'interwoven into the fabric of our nationhood by the process of multicultural interaction'.[7] This will benefit the community and reinforce its democratic nature. Ethnic identity, if accepted by the community, gives people self-confidence.

(3) 'All our citizens should have the opportunity to study the language, customs and habits of a variety of cultures, particularly those related to our migrant populations.' The basis of this principle is stated as the same as that for

the second principle, along with the need for a wide range of studies in multicultural education or ethnic studies to 'reinforce the common elements as well as the special differences of these groups.'

The statement concludes with recognition of the central importance of the attitudes of teachers, and therefore, of adapting teacher training courses. Parent involvement and patterns of administration are also noted as of great importance, but these comments are not developed.

Between 1979 and 1984 substantial changes to the administrative structure of education in Victoria were in process. The governing principles are summarised in Ministerial Paper No. 5.[8] They provide for devolution of responsibility to regional boards and to the councils of primary and secondary schools; 'a policy development process which allows those who are to implement policies and those who will be affected by them to participate in curriculum planning.'

The proportion of membership of the reconstituted councils will be as follows:

(a) Parents (including representatives of parents' clubs) shall constitute no less than—
- half of a primary school council, and
- one-third of a post-primary school council.

(b) Staff shall constitute no more than—
- half of a primary school council, and
- one-third of a post-primary school council. (Members of staff with children at the school at which they teach shall only be eligible for election through this category.)

(c) There shall be adequate student representation in post-primary schools in relation to school size and structure.

(d) Up to one-fifth of the total membership may be co-opted by the elected council to represent wider community interests.

(e) The principal shall be a voting member of the council and, for the purposes of co-option, shall be considered as an elected member.

The electorate from which these members will be drawn is based on the concept of a school community defined by the catchment area of the school which may not be the same as the local government electoral district. The persons concerned with the school may not have their lives centred in the locality; teachers may not live in the school catchment area; urban parents do not necessarily work where they reside. The school council must be representative of, and be supported by parents, teachers, students and neighbourhood.

Can a school catchment area be a neighbourhood, a potential community, in which the interests of all who live there will be represented on a school council?

The question before us is: how does this re-allocation of the power to make decisions affect the development of multicultural education? Is the Queensland principle of thrust for change coming from the central offices of the Education Department more effective for this purpose?

The answer will depend on judgements about matters which have been already raised in this paper. It was said in Section 1 that 'public interest is measured by the soundness of the decisions reached in the light of the needs of the community and by the scope of public participation in reaching them.' The Victorian policy of devolving responsibility is clearly an attempt to ensure maximum popular

participation in the curricula of individual schools. The question at issue in an industrialised, mobile society is that of defining the boundaries of the units of participating democrats. For example:

> demographic patterns of residence in Melbourne and in Victoria generally reveal clusters of subcultures—religious, class based, recent and established immigrant groups with indistinct boundaries.[9] Studies show a considerable mobility of immigrant and longer established families and individuals between districts and interstate. The 'Brusec' experiment shows that it is possible for committed people to create a community of a group of schools; this is difficult to achieve in areas where mobility is high and where the concentrations of immigrant people are temporary.

In practice in Victoria responsibility for curricula is shared between central authorities and schools. In cases where disputes arise at school level because of cultural dissonance, i.e. differences in values, conventions of behaviour or expectations of schooling, it may be necessary to set up an independent curriculum policy appeals tribunal. The Victorian Education Department, it is said, must 'ensure that schools do not devise programs that promote narrow sectional interests or that exclude important aspects of learning'.

It has been pointed out in this paper that these issues become more important as the cultural distance between the persons concerned becomes greater. Certain difficulties that have arisen are straightforwardly practical: the cost of attending meetings, the time involved, the power plays of persons accustomed to forwarding vested interests.

The Education Department retains control in critical areas, e.g. finance, appointment and promotion of staff. Support services can also be used either to facilitate or restrain change. Some school councils have been unwilling to accept the heavy new responsibilities envisaged.

The administrative apparatus of hegemonic control can be modified by enlisting local participation in some areas of decision-making. Final responsibility cannot be abrogated, but the differences in administering policies are significant. The underlying rationale of the Victorian procedures is that prejudice and misunderstanding will be dissolved by ordinary people working together to achieve a program for a school. The centralised system depends on the wisdom and skill of the professionals to devise a program which will come to be acceptable to all.

There is a further point; if the objective is 'equality of outcome' then the definition of the groups between whom comparisons are to be made is critical. Disadvantaged schools are defined by the socio-economic status of the intake area, not by the finances and programs of the school itself.[10] If the concept of equality is thus divorced from the program of the school, uniformity of provision loses its significance. Yet 'equality of outcome' is to be measured by material success in a competitive world.

Is this to be brought about by denying access to tertiary education to those not from disadvantaged backgrounds, regardless of achievement? This has been tried by some revolutionary regimes but not for long. Disadvantage in this context is socio-economic—recent immigrant origin is, as was argued above, one but not the only factor in producing disadvantage.

The key points of this paper are the concept of 'rights' and the problems involved in the resolution of 'cultural dissonance'. How do these issues emerge in practice?

The places where languages are taught is a test of the rights of native speakers of languages other than English. Political considerations dictate haste in introducing community languages into school programs. Linguists are concerned to protect world and regional languages which have established educational grounds for inclusion. There is debate about what the achievable and desirable goals are and also about methods of teaching.

It seems that perhaps belatedly it has become recognised in Australian educational circles that bilingualism is not an esoteric achievement but commonplace in some other countries. It seems to be generally accepted now that equal proficiency in two languages is not likely but that efficient communication and enjoyment of literature in two languages does occur. It is also generally accepted that a language must be used if proficiency is to develop in parallel with age.

If this analysis is accepted, the arguments for enabling students to learn initially in their mother tongue and to continue using that language for some learning in other subjects seem cogent. Home language maintenance programs for minority group children can be justified on educational grounds, and the problems of implementing these become the focus of discussion. For children whose native language is English the same arguments apply. The second language would be introduced at an appropriate stage and *with the same thoroughness as ESL is taught*. In his *Contribution to debate on Language in the Curriculum*— Modern Language Teachers Association of Victoria 12/10/84, Dr T. Quinn quotes a Canadian specialist, James Cummins, who estimates that 50-80 per cent of total school time would give a reasonable chance of success in achieving a usable proficiency in the terms mentioned above.[11]

These issues are canvassed in a discussion paper, *The Place of Community Languages in Victorian Schools*, issued by the State Board of Education and MACMME in October 1984, which sums up the practical problems of the choice of languages to be offered in each school. The demographic maps emphasise the Australia-wide difficulty of choice. If the native tongue is a dialect, should this be taught? Should parents and/or children be free to choose whether to be taught in the first language? If one has a right to be taught in one's native tongue, can this be organised for members of small scattered minority groups? Is the answer to be found in co-operation between ethnic and systemic schools?

At this point the discussion is not about whether bilingualism is desirable in keeping with broad policies of multiculturalism; it is about the capacity of children of various ages and of a wide range of linguistic experience in their mother tongue to acquire proficiency in a second language; it is about the evidence that a short, limited acquaintance with a second language promotes positive feelings towards persons belonging to that culture; it is about the competing vested interests of teachers of modern languages; it is about the curriculum as a whole. What must be discarded to implement these programs? It is about justification of cost.

To these general questions of feasibility must be added certain problems in States which promote the devolution of decision-making to individual school councils. In schools where there are a number of speakers of more than one language other than English, the choice of a community language will be stressful. If the solution of sending some children to other schools or giving credit for work done in ethnic school or Saturday School is adopted, should English speakers also be allowed a choice?

Some practical problems in providing suitable materials for multilingual educational facilities are exemplified by *Standards for Multicultural Public Library Service* published in Melbourne, 1982, by the Working Group on Multicultural Library Services (Victoria) and the Library Council of Victoria. The pamphlet explains that 'the major problem was the extent to which equity demanded equality of provision of materials and services (between various linguistic groups); this also includes the problem of how very small minorities can be fairly treated'. The report goes on:

> in setting out this principle of equality of provision for all of Australia's ethnic groups, as the fundamental principle of these standards, we are aware that *it cannot stand without modification in practice.*

The available statistics (as we noted in the demographic section) are by birthplace; these provide little guidance in providing book and non-book materials. 'An inevitable inequality' will remain because of the dearth of books in other languages comparable to those in English, and demand by non-English language groups may not equal that of native English speakers. Demand will vary between linguistic groups from time to time in different municipal areas.

The authors refer hopefully to 'a general spirit of equity' and to the need for additional subsidies, to the allocation of multicultural services within the overall system of priorities and to providing for language learning. These standards are in keeping with the policy of the Victorian Government and the State Board of Education. They direct our attention to the enormous task of organising and carrying out these aspirations. Finances and trained personnel for developing and/or importing materials are not now available in Australia.

Taxpayers in all language groups are not yet convinced that calls on the public purse for this aspect of primary and secondary education have a higher priority than other aspects of schooling and tertiary education, or welfare, defence, roads and public housing.

To turn from multilingual education to multicultural is to enter on a somewhat different order of argument.

There are strong utilitarian arguments both for ESL and for second language learning. Diplomacy, the army, commerce, interpreting and translating all call for such skills. There are straightforward educational arguments that have been advanced for a long time for a thorough grasp of a foreign language and literature. Community language learning can be argued for on grounds of promoting inter-cultural communication. Though some Canadian evidence indicates that the possibility of this occurring does not mean that it will occur. Factors other than language erect barriers between cultural groups.

The infusion of a multicultural emphasis throughout the curriculum does not depend on such directly utilitarian grounds for justification. Some supporters will rest their case on the rights of children to have access to the history, literature and art of their ancestors. Some will argue that syllabi have been changed over time to meet the broadening catchment areas for primary, secondary and tertiary education. They say demand for multicultural syllabi reflects the demographic changes in the population of educable age. For example, changes in the history syllabus the assertion of the Australian nationalism came after the British Empire lost its premier place as object of study. History teachers in schools are influenced by changes in the discipline. Their attention has been deflected from constitutional and political history to the social and economic considerations which focus on women in the past and the state of the voiceless majority. New text books are

being written in this framework. Society will be described in its complexity. Will it be understood in its complexity by pupils?

There are arguments about what should be learned and when it can be learned. Not all educators are convinced by the claims made by *Teaching for Human Rights Activities for Schools*, that given the opportunity most students begin by upper primary to make thoughtful profound observations about

- human rights and the law
- life
- freedom of conscience, opinion and expression
- freedom of assembly, association
- participation in public affairs
- economic, social and cultural well-being
- non-discrimination: racism
- non-discrimination: sexism
- the family
- education.

One such observation quoted does not give us the age of the child or the context in which it was spoken or written:

> I think that rights sort of holds people together. It's sort of people's needs and without them I think we'd all be miserable.[12]

It is possible to espouse the teaching of human rights: indeed, a classroom teacher does so many times a day. 'Jean, don't hit Billy. He is smaller than you and it hurts him' — 'Abdul you must obey Miss Smith even if she is a woman' — 'Harry you are not allowed to tease Ah Fong. He is a person the same as you.' The command, the explanation and the model the teacher provides are more effective at some ages than abstract generalisations.

The media ensure that children have a daily acquaintance with mass starvation, racial hatred, brutality, sexual perversion and theft. It is indeed a challenge to teachers to make adult behaviour explicable to children in terms appropriate to their age and understanding.

The technical problems of appropriate teaching strategies bring us back to the issues raised in Section 1. In the past, when adults were concerned with children's behaviour rather than with their understanding and sentiments, it was enough if children said and did the *right thing*. Trying to achieve change in a generation's attitudes requires that teaching waits patiently on the growth of understanding as the daily experiences of childhood are reflected upon. Also the goal of the change must be clear.

The ideal of multicultural education poses this challenge. Ethical relativism offers no sustaining guide to action. Rationalism has its own intolerance of belief.

In Section I of this paper multiculturalism was said to encapsulate a paradox, that is, a statement that is apparently contradictory or absurd but states a truth. After exploring the problems in the endeavour to implement the paradox in the policies and practice of education, the truth stands out, simple and plain to see.

The paradox of multiculturalism contains two truths, two conflicting goods, two proper demands on members of society. It is good to cherish and respect the lives and ways of those nearest and dearest to us. It is good to adhere to tribal ways unless contact with other ways, other codes, convince us that these ways are immoral—*but* it is also good to work for the good of the society

wider than that of our group or tribe, and it is good to consider the welfare of our nation and of all mankind.

We are all impaled on the horns of this dilemma which the term multiculturalism does not state with precision sufficient to be a guide to action. Our most pressing problems do not involve a choice between good and evil but between two actions, each good.

This is the dilemma which besets educators in Australia. It has always been so but it has become more pressing as more groups with different codes and customs add to the pattern of minority groups and within them and within the majority group the cultural divisions of socio-economic status and gender.

The conflict between educators is between persons who choose one or other of the conflicting goods as basic. To embody both these good ends in curricula, in the light of what is known about child development, adult prejudice, fear and intolerance challenges the heart and mind.

NOTES TO SECTION 1: Theoretical background

1. Brian Bullivant, *The Pluralist Dilemma in Education* (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1981), p.183.
2. Jean Martin, 'Migrants: Equality and Ideology 1972' in *The Ethnic Dimension*, ed. Sol Encel (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1981), p.32.
3. Charles Price, *Jewish Settlers in Australia*. Social Science Monograph No.28. The Australian National University. Note to p.1.
4. N.S.W. Department of Education Multicultural Policy Statement 1983:

   > All Australians have an ethnic (cultural) identity, whether they be of Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal background, of English speaking or non-English speaking background. The identity is both a link with a cultural heritage and a focus for a present sense of belonging to a group. It is recognised that in an open society the degree of identification of an individual with a particular group is optional and may vary with time and social circumstance.

5. *The Ethnic Dimension*, ed. Sol Encel (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1981), p.9.
6. The Australian Constitution gives the Commonwealth Government power to make laws about 'the people of any race'. (51 XXVI)
7. Martin, *The Migrant Presence* (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1978), p.17.
8. Mr. Justice Starke in Ex Parte Walsh and Johnson; in re Yates (1925) (37 CLR 36 at p.137).
9. Ibid. This case and subsequent decisions are discussed in *Australian Law Journal* Vol. 24 of 18.5.1950 by Jean Malor, pp.3-7.
10. See, for example, J.P. Plamenatz, *Consent, Freedom and Political Obligation* (O.U.P., 1938), ch.4. A.C. Ewing, *The Individual, the State and World Government* (Macmillan, New York, 1947), ch.2.
11. Martin in *The Migrant Presence*, p.26. Note quotes V. Menart, Vice Chairman of the Ethnic Communities Council of N.S.W.
    that there is no reason why ethnic minorities could not be protected by special legislation. (Lukas 1977).
12. B. Paul Komisar & James E. McClellan, 'The Logic of Slogans' in *Language and Concepts in Education*, ed. Smith & Ennis (Rand McNally, U.S.A., 1961), pp.195-215.
    I. Sheffler, *The Language of Education* (Thomas, U.S.A., 1960), pp.36-47.
13. J. Martin, 'Migrants: Equality and Ideology 1972' in *The Ethnic Dimension*, ed. Sol Encel (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1981), p.182.
14. Martin, Ibid. p.152.
15. Milton Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1964), p.144.
16. Barbara Falk, *Personal Identity in a multicultural Australia*. Buntine Oration 1978. Published for the Australian College of Education-Australian Council of Educational Research, p.13.
17. Peter Bachrach, *The Theory of Democratic Elitism* (University of London Press Ltd. 1969. 3rd impression 1972), p.3.

18. George Smolicz, 'sometimes also *secure biculturals*' in for e.g. *The Australian School through Children's eyes*. J.J. Smolicz/M.J. Secombe. No.17. The *Second Century in Australian Education*, ed. R.J.W. Selleck (M.U.P.), p.99.
19. Brian M. Bullivant, *The Way of Tradition*. ACER Research Series No.103. 1978, ch.10.
20. K. Marx & F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1959), p.27 - Engels' Preface to the 1888 English edition; and
Werner Falk, 'Democracy and Capitalism in Max Weber's Sociology.' *The Sociological Review* Vol.XXVIII. Number 4. October 1935.
21. Milton Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1964), pp.51-54.
22. Marie de Lepervanche, 'From Race to Ethnicity' *The Australian & New Zealand Journal of Sociology* Vol.16. No.1. March 1980.
23. F. Lewins, *Class or ethnicity? Class and Ethnicity*. Paper presented to Conference on Ethnicity and Class, University of Wollongong, 27-29 August 1981 - drawing on Weber's *The Protestant Ethic* p.12.
24. Ibid.
25. Commonwealth Department of Education, *Towards a National Language Policy* (Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1982).
26. *Education for a Multicultural Society*. A Discussion Paper based on the Report to the Council of Directors of the Queensland Department of Education, June 1979. - Third Printing 1984.
27. See note 5 above.
28. Theodorson, G.A. and A.C., *Modern Dictionary of Sociology*, 1969.
29. *Victorian State Board of Education Act* (1984), S.10.
30. Marlene Norst, in Barbara Falk & Joy Harris (eds), *Unity in Diversity* (The Australian College of Education, Carlton Victoria, 1983), pp.101-107.
31. Ibid., p.106.
32. Jean Martin, *The Migrant Presence* (George Allen & Unwin, Australia, 1978), p.17.

NOTES TO SECTION 2: Demography and Party Political Background

To Section 2. Demography and policies.....

1. R.J. Cameron, *Census of Population & Housing*, 30 June 1981. Summary Characteristics of Persons & Dwellings. Australia (Aust. Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, 1983), Tables 8 & 9. Hereafter: *Census*.
2. R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... New South Wales. (1983) Tables 8 & 9.
3. A.R. Bagnall, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Victoria. (1983) Tables 8 & 9.
4. R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Queensland. (1983) Tables 8 & 9.
5. R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... South Australia. (1983) Tables 8 & 9.
6. R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Western Australia. (1983) Tables 8 & 9.

7. R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Tasmania. (Aust. Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, 1982) Tables 8 & 9.
8. A.R. Bagnall, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Australian Capital Territory. (1982) Tables 8 & 9. & R.J. Cameron, *Census*. Summary Characteristics... Northern Territory. (1982) Tables 8 & 9.
9. *Melbourne... a social atlas. Atlas of Population and Housing, 1981 Census, Volume 3*. Commentaries by C.A. Maher (Division of National Mapping and Aust. Bureau of Statistics in association with Institute of Australian Geographers, Canberra, 1984).
10. Lindsay Tanner, 'The Policy Formulation Process of an Australian Political Party in Opposition: A Case Study of the Australian Labor Party's Schools Commission Proposal' in Imelda Palmer (ed.), *Melbourne Studies in Education 1983* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1983).
11. Australian Labor Party Platform, Constitution and Rules 1984. Section H. Ethnic and Multicultural Education.
12. Liberal Party of Australia. National Party of Australia. Policy on Education Summary.
13. Ibid.
14. The State Platform of the Western Australian Division of the Liberal Party as amended July 1982.
15. A New Liberal Policy for Primary and Secondary Education. Victorian Parliamentary Liberal Party 1984.

NOTES TO SECTION 3: Implementing policies—systems, schools and classrooms

1. K.N. Jones, *Policies for Participation 1977*, ed. John E. Watson. NZ Educ. Admin. Soc.
2. P. Komisar, 'Needs and the Needs Curriculum' in *Language and Concepts in Education*, B. Othanel Smith (ed.) (Rand McNally), pp.24-42.
3. Commonwealth Schools Commission. Program Guidelines Ch.5.
4. D. Cahill Report, p.99, quotes p.1 of Policy Statement.
5. *Education for a Multicultural Society*. A Discussion Paper based on the Report to the Council of Directors of the Queensland Department of Education.
6. Ministerial Paper No.6. Board of Education. Government Printer September 1984.
7. F. Galbally, *Migrant Services and Programs*. Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra, 1978.
8. Ministerial Paper No.5. Regional Boards of Education. Government Printer 1984.
9. See Section 2 above and Appendix 1.
10. See p.5 above.
11. J. Cummins, *Californian Schooling and Language Minority Students* 1981. Office of Bilingual and Bicultural Education. Sacramento California, pp.3-49.
12. R. Pittman, *Teaching for Human Rights*. Activities for Schools. (Hodja, Australia, 1984).

APPENDIX 1: DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS

(To be read *in conjunction* with Section 2 of the text.)

This appendix has been prepared using data from the 1981 Census, in order to make some of the material more readily available to members of NACCME. Information on settlement patterns at the individual urban level is readily available in accessible form in the excellent series of atlases prepared by the Bureau of Statistics. To augment the summary of the situation in Melbourne, refer to the publication *Melbourne - a social atlas, Commonwealth of Australia, 1984.*

New South Wales

As the most populous State in 1981, New South Wales also had the highest number of overseas-born people of any State or Territory, representing 20.6 per cent of the population. This was by no means the highest proportion in any State or Territory; only Tasmania and Queensland had a smaller proportion of overseas-born. This can be misleading unless it is pointed out that of these, less than one-third were from England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, whereas most other States attracted considerably higher proportions of Anglo-Celtic migrants. Ethnic diversity in N.S.W. was the greatest of any State; 38 groups comprised at least 0.5 per cent of the total of the overseas-born, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. The Italian and Yugoslav communities were the largest groups of immigrants from non-English speaking backgrounds although these communities were less significant proportionally than were the two largest groups in Victoria—the Italian and Greek-born. (N.S.W.—Italian 1.5 per cent and Yugoslav 1.2 per cent of population. Victoria—Italian 3.0 per cent and Greek 1.9 per cent of population.)

Other important groups in N.S.W. are the Greek-born (0.9 per cent of population) and the German-born (0.7 per cent). By adding together the Lebanese-born (0.7 per cent) and the Egyptian-born (0.3 per cent), we see that 1 per cent of the N.S.W. population came from Arabic-speaking backgrounds. (N.S.W., for example, had 75 per cent of the Australian Lebanese-born population.)

Although making up only 0.2 per cent of the N.S.W. population, 45.3 per cent of the Spanish-born and 64.3 per cent of the Portuguese-born in Australia lived in N.S.W.

35,367, or 22.1 per cent of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders live in N.S.W. and constitute 0.7 per cent of the total population of N.S.W.—a similar proportion to the Lebanese-born.

Victoria

Although the proportion of overseas-born residents of Victoria—(23.9 per cent)—was not the highest for Australia, Victoria has more overseas-born residents from non-English speaking backgrounds than any other State or Territory; 14.8 per cent of the Victorian population compared with 11.8 per cent for New South Wales and 3.8 per cent for Tasmania. On the other hand, the proportion of Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders was very low compared with other States and Territories, being only 0.1 per cent of the Victorian population.

Victoria had three ethnic groups from non-English speaking countries which comprised a larger proportion of the population than did the largest group in N.S.W. These were the Italian, Greek and Yugoslav-born.

German and Dutch-born, Maltese and Polish-born were also important groups. Smaller, yet still substantial presences were the Vietnamese, Indian, Turkish, Egyptian, Cyprian, Lebanese, Malaysian and Sri Lankan-born

populations. Of these, the Turkish and Sri Lankan-born were peculiarly concentrated in Victoria, with over half their total Australian populations in that State. The ethnic diversity of the population was fairly high, with 32 groups comprising at least 0.5 per cent of the total including the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and overseas-born populations.

Queensland

Although the third largest State in terms of population, in 1981 Queensland had the second lowest proportion of immigrants, only Tasmania being more markedly Anglo-Celtic Australian. Of Queensland's 2,295,123 people, 14.4 per cent were born overseas, but only 5.5 per cent were born in non-English speaking countries, and of this small percentage, some would have come from English speaking backgrounds. For example, many born in Papua New Guinea would, presumably, have been the children of expatriate Australians who have now returned to Australia. A large number of the Papua New Guinea-born population in Australia live in Queensland—42.3 per cent, comprising 0.3 per cent of the Queensland population.

Of those from English speaking countries, New Zealanders, it seems, were flocking to the warmer climes of Queensland in 1981; they comprised over 2 per cent of that State's population, the highest for any Territory or State, although the Northern Territory came a close second, with exactly 2 per cent of its population New Zealand-born.

The three largest groups from non-English speaking countries were the Italians, the Dutch and German-born. Yugoslav, Greek and Polish-born were also presences worth mentioning. As in the rest of Australia, the most important group of recent immigrants were the Vietnamese-born, with over a seven-fold increase in their numbers since the 1976 Census. The small proportion of the Queensland population represented by these groups emerges, however, when it is noted that their total numbers were proportionally less than Melbourne's single largest immigrant group, those born in Italy.

Nevertheless, the spread of ethnic diversity remained reasonably substantial with 28 ethnic groups having over 0.5 per cent of the total of the overseas-born, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. The last-named peoples were particularly significant in Queensland; nearly a quarter of Australia's Aboriginal population lived in Queensland. Consequently there were more Aborigines than any immigrant group apart from the English and New Zealand-born. As Torres Strait Island is part of Queensland, over 70 per cent of Australian Torres Strait Islanders lived in Queensland in 1981.

South Australia

South Australia had a fractionally higher percentage of overseas-born residents than Victoria (22.9 per cent, compared with 22.8 per cent), but a considerably higher proportion of these people were born in English speaking countries. For example, 9.7 per cent of South Australia's population were born in England; these together with other English speakers from the U.K., the American and African continents and New Zealand constituted over half of the overseas-born population, so that only 10.2 per cent of the South Australian population were born overseas in non-English speaking countries.

The South Australian population was comprised of relatively fewer large ethnic groups than most other Australian States—only 24 groups constituted at least 0.5 per cent of the total of the overseas-born, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. A concomitant of this was that a few immigrant

groups were numerically very important. The Italian-born population of South Australia was, proportionally, second only to Victoria's (2.4 per cent compared with 3.0 per cent) and the German-born second only to the A.C.T.'s (1.1 per cent compared with 1.2 per cent). The Greek-born were almost as numerous as the Germans, and were followed by the Dutch, Yugoslav and Polish-born. Overall, immigrants from Asia, the Americas, Africa and Oceania were under-represented in the South Australian population.

There were notable absences of significant numbers of several immigrant groups which were well represented in some other States. For example, there were few persons born in Malta, Portugal, China, Lebanon or Turkey in South Australia in 1981. The numbers of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders were also relatively small, comprising only 0.7 per cent of the population.

Western Australia

In 1981, Western Australia had the highest proportion of overseas-born immigrants. Most of these people, however, were born in English speaking countries; Western Australia had the highest proportion of English-born of any State in Australia—exactly 12 per cent of its total population. Western Australia had only 10.5 per cent of its population born in non-English speaking countries; its ethnic diversity was very low, with only 21 groups comprising at least 0.5 per cent of the total of the overseas born, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island populations.

Of those born in non-English speaking countries, the most important groups demographically were the Italian-born with 2.3 per cent of the population, followed by the Dutch, Yugoslav and Indian-born. Other European-born groups were those of German and Polish birth.

A distinctive feature of the Western Australian population was the number of immigrants from the Indian Ocean basin. Those born in India represented 0.8 per cent of the population compared with the Australia-wide figure of 0.3 per cent, and over 60 per cent of those born in Burma and resident in Australia were living in Western Australia, making the numerically largest settlement of Burmese-born in Australia: 0.3 per cent of that State's population. This is all the more remarkable considering only 8.7 per cent of the total Australian population lived in Western Australia.

Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam were also close South East Asian neighbours with sizable numbers of people born in those countries living in Western Australia. Although the number of Vietnamese-born living in Western Australia was small compared with some other States, the proportional increase was the most dramatic in Australia; the population in 1981 was thirty-six times the tiny number who lived there in 1976.

Western Australia had the highest proportion of people born in African countries of all States and Territories. The distinction is even more notable if the Arab Republic of Egypt is considered separately. (This country is often considered as part of the Middle East, rather than as part of Africa—its people have demonstrated settlement patterns similar to others from the Middle East, settling primarily in Sydney and Melbourne.) Over a quarter of the Malawian, Tanzanian, Ugandan, Zambian (these four countries were classified together in the Census), Kenyan and Zimbabwean-born population in Australia lived in Western Australia; this must be balanced against the fact that only 8.7 per cent of the total Australian population lived in this State. Western Australia was the only State where people born in each of these three areas of black Africa

constituted 0.1 per cent of the total population. The total number from these countries was numerically greater in Western Australia than in any other State or Territory. The South African-born population was also the highest proportionally of all States and Territories—0.3 per cent—but the South African-born populations of New South Wales and Victoria were numerically larger. The most important non-Anglo-Saxon group in Western Australia, however, was the Australian Aborigines. More than 20 per cent of the Aboriginal population of Australia lived in Western Australia, where they comprised 2.4 per cent of that State's population.

Tasmania

The most notable feature of the Tasmanian population of 418,957 was its predominantly Anglo-Celtic character; only 10.2 per cent of the population were born overseas, and only 3.8 per cent were born in non-English speaking countries—the lowest figures for all Australia.

The structure of the small part of the Tasmanian population born overseas was quite distinctive. Tasmania was the only State where the Dutch-born population was the largest group; they comprised 0.7 per cent of the population, and were the only group which was markedly over-represented in in the Tasmanian population compared with the rest of Australia. Other ethnic groups with notable concentrations in Tasmania were the German-born (0.5 per cent) and the Italian and Polish-born (both with 0.3 per cent). The Italian presence was by far the lowest in Australia compared to 1.9 per cent nationally. The Greek population was similarly small, and there were many groups with minute numbers in proportion to the rest of Australia; notably the Maltese, Portuguese, Lebanese, Turkish and Egyptian-born. The Vietnamese-born population in Tasmania had increased only four-fold between the 1976 and 1981 Censuses, the slowest rate of increase of any Australian States. Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders constituted as large a section of the population as the Dutch-born.

The ethnic diversity in Tasmania was relatively low, with only 24 groups comprising at least 0.5 per cent of the total of the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and overseas-born populations. Note that the population figures from which this was calculated were so small that a group had to have only 204 members in the whole State to be counted.

Australian Capital Territory

The two Australian Territories, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory, had the smallest populations of all States and Territories. Of the 221,609 residents in the Australian Capital Territory in 1981, 22.3 per cent were born overseas. Many were from English speaking countries, with the 0.6 per cent U.S.A.-born population being notable.

The A.C.T. was the only State or Territory where the Yugoslav-born were the largest ethnic group; they comprised 1.6 per cent of the population in an area where 12.5 per cent of the population were born in non-English speaking countries. Other notable immigrant presences were the Italian-born, followed by the Dutch and Greek-born. Those born in Finland, Poland, Malaysia, Vietnam, Austria, India, Spain and Hungary were also well represented.

There were some notable variations from the rest of Australia; many Northern and Central European groups were over-represented, particularly the Finnish-born, but also the Norwegian, Austrian, Belgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Swiss, French, German and Estonian-born groups. Of the Southern Europeans, the

Spanish were over-represented, followed by the Yugoslav-born, but the Maltese, Greek and Italian-born were under-represented. Of the larger Asian immigrant groups, the Malaysian-born were over-represented in the A.C.T., but the over-representation of the smaller Laotian and Thai-born groups was more marked. Aboriginal numbers were small, comprising only 0.3 per cent of the A.C.T.'s population. Ethnic diversity was great, with 35 groups having at least 0.5 per cent of the total of the overseas-born, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island peoples.

Northern Territory

The composition of the tiny Northern Territory population of 123, 324 was interesting. Nearly 20 per cent of Australia's Aborigines lived in the Northern Territory comprising almost 25 per cent of the total population of the Territory. In addition to this, 18.1 per cent were born overseas, many in English speaking countries (0.8 per cent U.S. presence being notable); 8.9 per cent of the Northern Territory population were born in non-English speaking countries, of which the largest group was the Greek-born (1.1 per cent), followed by the Timorese, German, Italian, Dutch, Malay, Philippino and Yugoslav-born.

The Timorese were the most over-represented group in the Northern Territory with 28.8 per cent of the national total of Timorese-born, all the more remarkable considering that only 0.8 per cent of the total Australian population lived there. Other over-represented groups from neighbouring lands were those born in Thailand, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and Indonesia. A pattern of over-representation of some northern and central European groups emerged, similar to that for the A.C.T.; the Danish, Belgian, Swiss, Czech, French and Swedish-born were all notably over-represented, while the Polish, Italian, Maltese, Yugoslav, Lebanese, Turkish and Egyptian-born were under-represented.

A comparison between the ethnic diversity of the Northern Territory and that of other States is difficult because of the enormous difference in the proportion of Aborigines in the population of the Territory. If the calculations are made in the same way as they were for the other States—that is, by adding the populations of overseas-born, Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, and calculating which groups comprised at least 0.5 per cent of this population—the Northern Territory appears as the least diverse with only 20 groups. Yet, if separate figures were available for all the different Aboriginal tribes, the Territory would certainly appear as one of the most diverse of States. If the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations were omitted, the ethnic diversity of the overseas-born is great, with 35 groups comprising at least 0.5 per cent of those born overseas.

The demography of Melbourne

Residential patterns for all overseas-born for 1981 show a relatively even spread throughout Melbourne. The index of segregation for the overseas-born was relatively low (19.7) compared with the segregation of the Australian-born with both parents born in Australia (20.5) and people who worked in the trades, process work and labouring (19.5).

Melbourne had 28.2 per cent of its population born outside Australia in 1981, second only to Perth with 31.2 per cent, and up from 27.5 per cent in 1976. This increase was the result of loss of Australian-born to other parts of Australia, with the population being maintained by immigration.

The overseas-born taken as a whole may be reasonably well integrated, but, as geographer C.A. Maher wrote in the commentaries in the atlas, if persons from non-English speaking countries are singled out for analysis, 'within

Melbourne, language and culture have a strong influence on residential patterns, as is reflected by the relatively high segregation index of 30.4'. Melbourne, with 19.4 per cent of its population in this category, and Sydney with 17.4 per cent, have clearly been the most popular destinations for these people. The figures are remarkably higher than those for Brisbane (7.3 per cent) and Hobart (5.6 per cent). Maher attributes the pattern of segregation in Melbourne to a combination of economic and cultural factors. Post-war immigration has primarily served the labour needs of industry; jobs most frequently open to migrants have been in the industrial sector, concentrated in Melbourne in the north and west, with smaller areas in the south-east. The nature of available housing has also been an important consideration. Maher characterises cultural forces affecting patterns of segregation as a desire to be in relatively familiar surroundings which has encouraged concentrations of similar ethnic groupings around which commercial and social institutions tend to gather.

Between 1976 and 1981, the proportion of overseas born from non-English speaking countries in Melbourne rose from 18.4 per cent to 19.4 per cent. The loss of Australian-born to other parts of Australia emphasised the importance of immigration for the maintenance of Melbourne's population.

Recent arrivals (those resident in Australia for less than five years) especially those from non-English speaking countries, had a very distinctive pattern of residence (Index of Segregation—35.1). Institutional factors relating to the provision of post-arrival housing and public housing were particularly influential in determining where recent arrivals lived.

Over 107,000 Melbourne residents were identified as not speaking English well. As would be expected, the location pattern of this group was very similar to that of the overseas-born from non-English speaking backgrounds.

The Bureau of Statistics has calculated the correlations between the various features of population which were singled out by the Census questionnaire. These reveal that lack of facility with the English language is related to socio-economic status. There was a negative correlation with the population who were employed in professional, technical and administrative areas (R = -.46) and a positive correlation with people who worked in trades, process and labouring jobs (R = .55)

The fact that there was a high negative correlation with the population with trade qualification (R = -.54) and a positive correlation with those with no qualifications (R = .50) suggests that if trade, processing and labouring were analysed separately, the correlation with the population working in processing and labouring jobs would be even higher. It seems, however, that ability to communicate in English is a skill sought by nearly all employers, and that those with poor English may be disadvantaged even in the search for unskilled work.

The correlations between the population not fluent in English, the unemployed as a whole and the unemployed between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four, were .61 and .49 respectively. These were the highest figures of all the groups singled out for analysis, including Aborigines, the figures for whom were .52 and .47 respectively. This suggests the need for qualitative research about the link between language proficiency and access to employment.

Finally, a brief analysis of some of the most important ethnic minorities in Melbourne reveals some interesting aspects of the geographic location of these populations. There is a well established belief that when migrant groups first arrive in Australia, they concentrate in areas, then, as they become more accustomed to the country, they gradually disperse, displaying settlement patterns

similar to other Australians. The situation, however, is more complex than this. Clearly, economic, cultural and institutional factors result in different settlement patterns for different ethnic groups.

For example, a comparison between the German-born and Maltese-born population of Melbourne reveals remarkable differences between two relatively well established groups in Melbourne.

That residential segregation is not explicable solely in economic terms is indicated by the fact that the index of residential segregation for those working in the trades, processing and as labourers, was only 19.5 compared with figures ranging from 27.7 to 82.0 for individual ethnic groups. It is clear that cultural factors were important, and remain important as the continuation of segregation by relatively well established Italian and Greek communities indicates (Index of segregation 44.7 and 45.3 respectively). Services provided locally by a particular ethnic group for other members of that group help to maintain segregation. These include churches, schools, social welfare agencies, builders, lawyers, funeral parlours, supermarkets and clothing stores. While these needs are not adequately catered for within the mainstream of Australian society, localization of such services will continue to contribute to residential segregation.

It must not be assumed from this, however, that the continuation of ethnic segregation necessarily has damaging consequences. Continued residential segregation does not necessarily mark continued cultural segregation and tension between an ethnic group and the wider Australian community.

APPENDIX 2: A POLICY FOR NACCME AS ADVISOR AND CO-ORDINATOR OF RESEARCH IN MULTICULRUAL EDUCATION

NACCME has commissioned a number of papers which between them provide an analysis of the current situation in multicultural education in Australia. There are also a bewildering array of books: theoretical, anecdotal and descriptive. There are directives from Commonwealth and State departments to regions and schools; there are reports of monitored experimental programs; keeping up with the daily input of new written material is a formidable task. In stressing the tangled web that connects the generalisations to the actions of teachers and pupils in classrooms and playgrounds, this paper has been concerned to ask—what is the function of a co-ordinating body at this moment?

No Minister or Director General of Education has time to consider the conflicting theories and the necessarily incomplete data, yet as was said in another and tragic context, 'statistics don't bleed. . . Only the detail counts'.

There have been a number of recent annotated bibliographies of research in multicultural education. The questions which still need to be addressed are as follows:

What answers to questions are necessarily provisional and need to be asked many times and in many places? In what areas is repeated research redundant?

Has an assessment of the quality of previous work been made before new work is commissioned?

What issues are best explored by case studies, action research, statistical information gathering or conceptual analysis?

Research should be organised by type and area.—

Types of research should include:

- gathering new data
- basic research to clarify concepts
- case studies
- research studies comparing or proposing new techniques or methods
- analysis and dissemination of existing research findings, e.g. reports containing available data on current policies and practices and reports on present state of the art, submissions etc.

Works approved for method and reliability of findings should be compared to establish:

- congruent research findings
- contradictory research findings
- gaps indicating need for further research
- whether assumptions underpinning work are consistent with contemporary theories in education, psychology, sociology and politics. Are assumptions made explicit so that educators can make informed decisions?

The mammoth task of analysing the material in the categories suggested above has not been done. However, it may be tentatively suggested that it is action research which is likely to lead to a realistic appraisal of what it is possible for schooling to accomplish given the present financial and political situation.

Careful planning of a co-ordinated program would bear fruit. The choice of projects in which variables could be extracted would avoid wasteful duplication. Action research can be a powerful instrument for modifying attitudes of participants and is as likely to succeed as inservice courses.

NACCME has an important role to play in deflecting attention from reformulating slogans to seeking to uncover the next practical steps which are in conformity with the theoretical position the committee adopts.

In the course of this study the following bibliographies have been consulted:

(1) Dialog File 1.

(2) Australian Consolidated Industries. Education Resources Information Centre. Australia data.

(3) Clearing House on Migration Issues. Multicultural and Bilingual Education Search 1979-1984.

(4) Education Commission of N.S.W. 1984, Research in Multicultural Education.

(5) Education Research and Development Committee. Clearing House Investigation of Research and Innovation into Multi Cultural Education 1980.

(6) Commonwealth Department of Education. Directions for Research in Migrant Education.—Paul Nicoll. 1977.

(7) Australian Immigration. A Bibliography and Digest-Charles A. Price and Jean I. Martin (eds). 1975. Part 2.

(8) Chomi Bibliographies.
No. 7 Resources for Bilingual Bicultural Education Vol. 1. 1979
—Vol. 2. 1979.
Chomidas. 1975-1976.

(9) Self-listing of titles issued by Government and semi-Government Authorities, held by Barbara Falk (1984). Available if required.

(10) AIMA. Migrant and Refugee Youth in the Australian Labour Force. An annotated Bibliography 1984.

(11) AIMA. The Disabled Migrant in Australia.
An annotated Bibliography.

(12) Ministerial Policy Committee on Multicultural and Migrant Education. Victorian Government Printing Service, Melbourne 1984.
(a) Non-English Speaking Background Girls and Education.
(b) Non-English Speaking Background Parents and the School.

(13) Schools Commission. Educational Disadvantage. A Bibliography. 1979.

Printed by Canberra Publishing and Printing Co., Fyshwick, A.C.T.